A defence of that which hath bin written in the queſtions of the ignorant miniſterie, and the communicating with them. By IOHN PENRI.

THere bee two thinges (M. D. *Some*) wherein you by oppugning that trueth which out of the worde of God I had ſette downe, concerning the two former queſtions, haue beene wanting both vnto your ſelfe and to the cauſe; the defence whereof you vndertook. The former want of the 2. appeareth by your ſpare dealing in a matter of ſuch great waight; wherein you haue dealt with ſo illiberall a hande, that what hath bin written by you, might ſeem to proceed rather from any, then frō a man whoſe giftes and learning ſeemed to promiſe the affordinge, of greater and more waightie matters, then any ſet downe in that treatiſe.

The nomber of my reſons were many, you onely haue touched 2. of thē, the reſt are not dealt with. And therfore the cauſe as yet remaineth whol. For be it you had aunſwered theſe 2.

as you haue not, yet had you not ſatisfied the doutful cõſcience of thoſe that know not in theſe points which way to turn them, as long as any one of my reaſons remained vnanſwered.

In this point there is alſo another want, which I would had bin redreſſed. And that is of two ſorts. Firſt, a manifeſt going from the controuerſie; For the queſtion being, whether ignorant men, not ordained of God for the gatheringe together of the Saints, be miniſters or no; you leaue that, and prooue the Sacraments adminiſtred by them, viz. by popiſhe prieſts, and our dumbe miniſters in the daies of blindnes and ignorance to be ſacraments, which is no part of the matter in controuerſie, but another point to be diſcuſſed (if men will be gotten at all to enter therevnto) when the former is determined and decided.

Secondly, your reaſons are ſo few, & ſo commonly knowen vnto all, that for their nomber, a ſmall deale of paper might containe an anſwere vnto them,

BRITISH MUSEUM

them, for their noueltie, they coulde not put a man that had accordinge vnto knowledge, but once allowed of the cauſe, to anye great labour in anſwering them. As being things ſo commonly obiected by all, learned or vnlearned, that holde our readers to be miniſters, and thinke it lawfull to cómunicate with them, as by courſ of ſpech they fal vnto that diſcourſe, wher al men may eaſily ſee, that there was a great ouerſight committed by M. S O M E, in deeming that the oppugning of a cauſe countenanced by moſt of the godly learned, would be taken in hand by any, who could not anſwere the reaſons which he might be ſure would be obiected by al. And who could be ignorant, that the odious controuerſie, cócerning the profanation of baptiſme, both by popiſh prieſts & our dumb miniſters, would offer it ſelfe in the forefront to withſtand the trueth? that the ciuill magiſtracie, the miniſterie of the dumbe Leuites, the corrupt outward calling of our readers woulde require an an-

as you haue not, yet had you not satisfied the doutful cõscience of those that know not in these points which way to turn them, as long as any one of my reasons remained vnanswered.

In this point there is also another want, which I would had bin redressed. And that is of two sorts. First, a manifest going from the controuersie; For the question being, whether ignorant men, not ordained of God for the gatheringe together of the Saints, be ministers or no; you leaue that, and prooue the Sacraments administred by them, viz. by popishe priests, and our dumbe ministers in the daies of blindnes and ignorance to be sacraments, which is no part of the matter in controuersie, but another point to be discussed (if men will be gotten at all to enter therevnto) when the former is determined and decided.

Secondly, your reasons are so few, & so commonly knowen vnto all, that for their nomber, a small deale of paper might containe an answere vnto them,

BRITISH MUSEUM

them, for their noueltie, they coulde not put a man that had accordinge vnto knowledge, but once allowed of the cauſe, to anye great labour in anſwering them. As being things ſo commonly obiected by all, learned or vnlearned, that holde our readers to be miniſters, and thinke it lawfull to cõmunicate with them, as by courſ of ſpech they fal vnto that diſcourſe, wher al men may eaſily ſee, that there was a great ouerſight committed by M. S O M E, in deeming that the oppugning of a cauſe countenanced by moſt of the godly learned, would be taken in hand by any, who could not anſwere the reaſons which he might be ſure would be obiected by al. And who could be ignorant, that the odious controuerſie, cõcerning the profanation of baptiſme, both by popiſh prieſts & our dumb miniſters, would offer it ſelfe in the forefront to withſtand the trueth? that the ciuill magiſtracie, the miniſterie of the dumbe Leuites, the corrupt outward calling of our readers woulde require an an-

ſwere, which are the reaſons, and the onely reaſons vſed by you.

The laſt want I finde in you, is contained in the inſufficiency of your reſons, which euidently ſhew the inſufficiencie of the cõcluſion, that would be inferred by them. Your reſons are all of them faultie, eyther becauſe they deſire that for granted which is the queſtion, or make thoſe things of like nature, wherin there is a gret diſſimilitude. Frõ the firſt of the 2. falts it commeth to paſſe, that you take for granted, that the writings of reuerende and godly men, as of Auguſtine, M. Beza, &c. will prooue that, which the word of the eternall God doth not warrant. Hence you take it graunted, that popiſh prieſts were miniſters: that the outwarde approbation of the Churche maketh a miniſter; that whenſoeuer the word of inſtitution is pronounced with the outward element, ther muſt preſently be a Sacrament, that I take an euill miniſter for no miniſter; that there was a nullity both of Caiphas his miniſtery,

niſterie, becauſe he came in by briberye, and of the litigious miniſters in the Church of Philippi, &c. Howſoeuer you take thoſe things as granted principles, yet they are the points in controuerſie, and ſo far from beeing yelded vnto by me, that I haue ſhewed euery one of them to be manifeſtly falſe. 1. Phil. 1. 15.

The diſsimilitude is in the reaſons drawn from the Leuitical prieſthood, and the ciui magiſtracie, with whom if you compare the miniſtery of the new couenaunt, you ſhall finde, firſte that you bring in a ſimilitude to ſhew that whiche is not prooued; and ſecondly that you make thoſe to bee twinnes, which all men muſt needes graunt to be as vnlike, as crooked & ſtraight lines are vnmatchable.

And thus much I thought needfull generally to ſet downe concerninge your manner of dealing: Not that I wold any way diſgrace, you whō I reuerence, for that is no part of mine intent, the Lorde is my witnes. Nay, I would be loth to let that ſyllable eſcape

ſcape me, that might giue you or any els the leaſt occaſion in the world, to thinke that I carrye any other heart towards you, then I ought to beare towards a reuerend learned man fearing God. And howſoeuer, vnles you alter your iudgment, I can neuer agre with you in theſe pointes; becauſe I am aſſured you ſwarue frō the truth: yet this diſagreement ſhalbe ſo farre from making a breach of that bonde of loue', wherewith in the Lord I am tyed vnto you, that I doubt not, but we ſhalbe at one in that day, when al of vs ſhall be at vnitie in him that remayneth one and the ſelfe-ſame for euer.

Now I am to come to your booke, from the 20. page whereof, vnto the 28. laying the foundation of the reaſons you vſe againſt mee, to prooue the lawfulnes of communicatinge with dum miniſters, you handle two neadles points. Firſt that they which were baptized by popiſh prieſts, haue receiued true baptim as touching the ſubſtance. Secondly that they are

the

the ſacramentes of baptiſme and the holy ſupper of the Lorde, which are deliuered in the Church of England by vnpreching miniſters. In theſe two pointes M. *Some*, you haue prooued nothing that my writinges haue denied; but you haue quickened a dead controuerſie, not vnlikely to giue the wrangling ſpirits of this age, cauſe to breed greater ſturres in the Church. I ſee no other effect, which the handling of theſe queſtions can bringe foorth but this. And it is to be feared that the ſlendernes of the reaſons vſed in your booke, to prooue that which you haue vndertaken to ſhew; will geeue occaſion vnto mannie, whoe of them-ſelues are too too readie to iangle, to doubt of that wherof before they made no queſtion. So that by ſeeking to ſtay the courſe of a needful cõtrouerſie, you haue both giuen it a larger paſſage, and opened the doore vnto a queſtion very fruitleſſe in our time. you know I deale in neither of theſe pointes. If you cannot be ſtayed from entring into contro-

trouerſies, that are very odious, and more impertinent vnto the matter in hand: it were good that the church were further and more ſoundly ſatiſfied by you in theſe 2. pointes, which you alone in our Churche haue publikly called in queſtion. And for mine owne parte, when you haue done, I know not who will be your aduerſarie, I ſee no reaſon whie I ſhould deal in controuerſies of ſo ſmal gaine. Of this I am aſſured, that neyther popiſh prieſts, nor any other ignoraunt guides are miniſters. whether the element adminiſtred by thē, be a ſacrament or no, look you to that, which haue in your treatiſe debated that, which my writings neuer called into queſtion. If you wil needs proue readers to be miniſters, becauſe you can not get me to denie that which hath bene adminiſtred to be a ſacrament, you ſhall but preſſe that which will prooue nothing. Your reaſon is, as if you ſhoulde ſaye, that eyther all they which ſupplie the places of miniſters are miniſters, or els an inconuenience

is likely to follow. A ſtrange manner of demonſtration, Gods ordinaunce muſt needs be thruſt out of the dores becauſe an inconuenience would be likely to enſue the admittinge of it. The cauſe will not be thus anſwered at your hands; and I am ſorie that a man ſo reuerende in mine eyes, hath dealt ſo vnſubſtantially in a matter belonging to the ſeruice of the euerliuing God: the ſlenderneſſe of the reaſon is apparant. In the latter ende of the booke I haue farther ſhewed the ſame; thither I am to referre you and the reader.

Now I coulde well ouerpaſſe theſe two pointes, becauſe of them ſelues they containe nothing that I hane withſtoode: But in as muche as you haue not onely grounded them vpō falſe principles, and ſuch as in no wiſe can be warraunted by the canon of the word, but alſo inferre vpon their grant, that our readers are miniſters, and conſequently, that it is no ſinne to communicate with them. I am firſt to ſet downe the ſtate of the queſti-

on,

trouerſies, that are very odious, and more impertinent vnto the matter in hand: it were good that the church were further and more ſoundly ſatiſfied by you in theſe 2. pointes, which you alone in our Churche haue publikly called in queſtion. And for mine owne parte, when you haue done, I know not who will be your aduerſarie, I ſee no reaſon whie I ſhould deal in controuerſies of ſo ſmal gaine. Of this I am aſſured, that neyther popiſh prieſts, nor any other ignoraunt guides are miniſters. whether the element adminiſtred by thē, be a ſacrament or no, look you to that, which haue in your treatiſe debated that, which my writings neuer called into queſtion. If you wil needs proue readers to be miniſters, becauſe you can not get me to denie that which hath bene adminiſtred to be a ſacrament, you ſhall but preſſe that which will prooue nothing. Your reaſon is, as if you ſhoulde ſaye, that eyther all they which ſupplie the places of miniſters are miniſters, or els an inconuenience

is

is likely to follow. A ſtrange manner of demonſtration, Gods ordinaunce muſt needs be thruſt out of the dores becauſe an inconuenience would be likely to enſue the admittinge of it. The cauſe will not be thus anſwered at your hands; and I am ſorie that a man ſo reuerende in mine eyes, hath dealt ſo vnſubſtantially in a matter belonging to the ſeruice of the euerliuing God: the ſlenderneſſe of the reaſon is apparant. In the latter ende of the booke I haue farther ſhewed the ſame; thither I am to referre you and the reader.

Now I coulde well ouerpaſſe theſe two pointes, becauſe of them-ſelues they containe nothing that I hane withſtoode: But in as muche as you haue not onely grounded them vpō falſe principles, and ſuch as in no wiſe can be warraunted by the canon of the word, but alſo inferre vpon their grant, that our readers are miniſters, and conſequently, that it is no ſinne to communicate with them. I am firſt to ſet downe the ſtate of the queſti-

on,

on, which in deed is and ought to be decided betweene you and me concerninge the elemente administred, both by popish priests, and other vnpreaching ministers: and secondly to examine the groundes whereby you prooue the element alreadie deliuered by them to be a sacrament, which you know I do not denie to be so.

And this is the point that concerneth our state rather then the other.

The question therefore is not whether the one or the other of them haue deliuered a sacrament in respect of the action done; but whether a christian going vnto them for those holy seales, may be assured, that hee can receiue the same at their handes. I affirme that wee can not; M. *Some* taketh it graunted that we may; my warrant is out of the worde, because there is no promise made to vs therin, that the action celebrated by such men, is a sacramentall action, and where there is no promise, there can bee no assuraunce, because our assurance ariseth onely of fayth, whiche must be grounded vpon the promises set downe in the word; wee haue

no

no promiſe that they can deliuer vs a ſacrament, becauſe they are no miniſters. For they onely are enioyned by our Sauiour Chriſt to deliuer a ſacrament, neither do we know what hee can deliuer which is no miniſter. Matth. 28. 18.19.

So that the queſtion is now growne to this iſſue, whether popiſh prieſtes and our vnpreachinge miniſters, bee miniſters or no; whom if I can proue to be none, then the matter is cleare, that no man going vnto them for the ſacrament, can aſſure himſelfe there to haue the ſame. And this ſhall be a generall reaſon, equally belonginge vnto both the pointes handeled by you, the particulars whereof ſhal follow in their places.

That no popiſhe prieſt therefore is a miniſter.

1 Euery miniſter muſt be at the leaſt by profeſsion, a member of the true Church. No popiſh priſt is by profeſsion a member of the true Church. Therfore no popiſh prieſt is a miniſter.

2 Euery miniſter hath an office with in the bodie of the Churche. No

popiſhe prieſt hath an office within the bodie of the Church. Therfore no popiſh prieſt is a miniſter. The propoſitions or firſt part of both theſe reaſons are ſet downe euidently and plainely by the wiſedome of God, in theſe wordes. For as we haue many members in one bodie, and all members haue not one office; ſo we being many, are one bodie in Chriſt, and euerye one an others members, ſeeing then that we haue giftes that are diuers. &c.

Rom. 12. 4 5. 6.

The place ſheweth cleerly, that whoſoeuer is not a member, is not of the bodie, if not of the body, then no miniſter. Againe, whoſoeuer is no member, he hath no office in the bodie; if no office, no miniſter. He that ſhould obiect that in this place is mentea member of the bodie, by election in the ſecret counſell of God, and not in the acknowledgemente of the Church by profeſsion, would not deſerue the anſwering. Becauſe it is vocation and not election, that maketh ſuch a member in the church as may haue

haue an office therein; of which ſort the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in this place. by vocation, I meane that whereof the holy ghoſte ſpeaketh, where it is ſaid, Many are called, but few are choſen: neither can any man denie him to be a member of the Churche, which by outward profeſsion ſubmitteth himſelfe vnto true religion, and ſuch are the members, whereof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh: namely ſuch as are mẽbers in the iudgement of the Church. Iudas was a member in the iudgement of the Churche, though not belonging to election. A further proofe of the propoſitions you ſhall find. 1.cor. 12.26,28. Hee was no prieſt in the olde teſtament, that was not a Iewe by profeſſion; yea, and of the line of Aaron to: and ſhall he be accounted a miniſter amõg vs, that is a ſtranger from the profeſsion of the trueth, & a profeſſed Idolater? Iſhmael & Eſau, were circumcized, and the ſonnes of thoſe fathers vnto whome the couenaunt was made; Euen I will be thy God, & the God of thy ſeed. They & their

Matth.20. 10.

To be a member ſo the true Church is one thing, and to bee a true member of the Church is another thing.

their posterities fell from true religion: well admit that the profanatió of circumcisió had stil cótinued in their houses: yet a man supplying the place of a priest among them, was no priest in deed, thogh he ten thousand times profaned circumcision, and woulde brag neuer so often, that he worshipped after his Idolatrous maner, no other God but the God of his father Abraham, & sware onely by the feare of his father Isaak. The reason herof, is, because that euery priest vnder the law, must be an Israelite by professió, that is a member of the true Church, neither could any of the godly assure them-selues, that an Edomitishe priest administred true circumcision according to the substance. Now I rekó of a popish prist no otherwise thē I would haue done of an Ismaelitishe or Edomitish circumcisiser; the profanation of that seal of the couenant, still continuing in mount Seir.

Whereas in the assumption or second part of both the reasons, I deny popish priestes to be members of the Church;

church; my meaning is not that there are none of the elect, within the bodie of poperie, whom the Lorde may cal in his good time: For I would not denie this vnto Mahometiſm, or that there are not left in poperie certaine rubiſhes and ſteps of true religion, for this difference I make betweene thē and other Infidels, though the Iewes alſo may claim this vnto themſelues. But I meane that the popiſh religion is ſuch a religion as whoſoeuer liueth and dyeth in the profeſſion thereof: he liueth & dieth out of the Church, where ſaluation is not poſsibly to be had, for any thing that is made knowen vnto man. Whence it neceſſarily followeth, that in poperie there is no Church. If it be obiected that the papiſtes are within the couenaunt, inaſmuch as long ſince they profeſſed the trueth. Mine anſwere wil be, that popery was neuer the trueth as yet, that no papiſt in that he was a papiſt, euer profeſſed the trueth, and that God made no couenant with profeſſed Idolators, as all papiſts are.

Anti-

2.Thes.2. 4. Antichriſt I grant ſhould ſit as God in the temple of God, but it was neuer the temple of God, ſince he planted his peſtilent chaire therein. Poperie in deede hath inuaded the ſeats and poſſeſsions of true religion, and began firſt where the trueth was profeſſed. For the myſterie of iniquitie firſt appeared within the Churche, & not elſe-where, where true religion flowriſhed, and not among the heathen: neyther coulde he be that aduerſarie, whoſe beginning ſhoulde be in Paganiſme. But although poperie tooke roote in the ſoyle where the true Churche was planted; yet it ſo grew there, that it ſtill continued to be the ſynagogue of Sathan, & could neuer as yet be the Churche of God; howſoeuer it hath ouergrowen the poſſeſsion thereof. And what though their fathers, who nowe are papiſtes, were within the couenant, as profeſſing true religion; ſhall it therefore followe that their Idolatrous ſonnes ſhould be ſo to: If they returne the Lorde hath mercie in ſtore for them

I denie not. But what is there in this point ſaid for the papiſtes, which the Iewes cannot with far more ſhewe of reaſon pretend for themſelues? The profaning of baptiſm among the papiſtes can make them no more to be within the Churche, then the continuance of the profanation of circumciſion among the Iſhmaelits & Edomits could keepe them vnder the couenant. And why ſhould Popiſh baptiſme any more tye the Lordes couenaunt to an Idolatrous race, then an Iſhmaelitiſh or Edomitiſh cutting off of the foreskinne, linke him to be the God of thoſe adulterous generations. Oh, but the Lorde himſelfe hath ſayd, In Iſaak ſhall thy ſeed be called, and Iaacob haue I loued, and hated Eſau; whie the ſame Lorde in reſpect of his reuealed wil, for with his ſecret election men muſt not meddle, hath ſaide, the profeſſors of true religion do I loue, but the Idolatrous papiſts my ſoule abhorreth; It will be heere demanded, whether I make no more account of popiſhe baptiſme, then of

Rom. 9.7.
gen. 21.12.
Mal. 1.2.3.
rom. 9.13.

Edomitish circumcision, I see no reason why I shoulde. For a circumcised Edomite being receiued, to be a true worshipper at Ierusalem, shoulde as well content himselfe with that circumcision (circumcision being not a thing inuented by man, or don in respecte of man, but ordained by the Lord, and done in regarde of the couenant made vnto Abraham) as wee do with popish baptism, which is not called in question.

And yet that which is spoken concerning the profession of the trueth, by the forefathers, is not altogether true in poperye; for there be many large regions nowe professing popery, where not so much as the name of Christ was heard, vntill they were become grossely popishe. So that their first step was out of paganisme vnto poperye. And this is the estate of all those poor oppressed vassals the west Indians, who now in great nombers profes Romish Idolatrie. For at such time as the Spanyard inuading their land, brought vppon them the most

miserа-

miſerable ſlauery of bodie and ſoule, that are vpon any people vnder heauen, they had not ſo much as hearde whether there was anye Chriſte, but were moſt hethniſh, & ſenceles Idolaters, as may appeare by the popiſhe hyſtoriographers them-ſelues, who wrote the ſtories of thoſe times. And therefore (to omit, whoſe poſterities many of the nations within Europe are, that haue refuſed the light of the Goſpell) though it were granted, that the reſt of the popiſh rable were with in the couenant; yet theſe miſerable hethé papiſts, can be ſaid to be vnder no couenant, but that which is made vnto poperie and paganiſme. I hope M *Some*, howſoeuer you may be perſwaded, that other popiſh ſhauelings can deliuer a ſacrament, yet that you will doubt, whether any man coulde be aſſured to receiue thoſe holy ſeals at the handes of the heathen maſſemongers remaining in Cuba, hiſpaniola, Mexico, or any other the Eaſtern partes.

Peter. M. de rebus Occeanicis. Decad 4.5.

And thus muche concerning the aſſump-

M. Caluin epist. 103.

assumption, I am not ignoraunt that famous and worthy men, haue otherwise written concerning the popishe Church, and therefore I am not to be presled with theyr authority.

I might in the 3. place vse againſt you M. *Some*, a reaſon of your owne thus concluded. No miniſterye is ſacriledge, becauſe euery miniſterye is an ordinance of God, which cannot be turned vnto ſacrileage. The popiſh priſthood is ſacriledg, as you haue ſet downe, page 21. Therfore the popiſh prieſthood is no miniſtery, and conſequently popish prieſts are no miniſters. You may ſee that you haue ouerthrown your owne cauſe. But this manner of reaſoninge, although it ſhould be of force againſt your ſelfe, inaſmuch as your owne wordes are brought to expreſſe your owne meaning, yet I account inſufficient, my third reaſon therefore is this.

3 They are no miniſters whoſe very miniſterye ouerthroweth directly the prieſthood of our ſauior chriſt But the very miniſtery of popishe

prieſts,

priests, directly ouerthroweth the priesthood of Christe: therefore they are no ministers.

I know not what can be pretended against the proposition, vnlesse men woulde dreame of a ministery, wyth whom the priesthood of the Lord Iesus cannot stande. The latter part of the reason is true, if it bee true that Christ is the onely sacrifice for sinne, that he is no more to be offred, that by once offering himselfe, he hath made full satisfaction for the sinnes of the whole worlde, and that the popishe priestes dayly sacrifice to apease Gods wrath, for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead.

Heb. 9.28. & 10.10. 1.iohn 1.7 act.4.12. Ephes.1.7. Heb.10. 12.15.and 9.26. Heb. 5.25. & 10.14.& 9.14.

Lastly, they are no ministers who are made, that is, called, elected & ordained by Idolaters. Popish priests are called, chosen and ordained by Idolators. Therefore they are no ministers.

The proposition appeareth in that a ministers can be made by none, but by such as vnto whom the Lord hath giuen leaue to deale in that action, o-

ther-

therwise the action is frustrate. As if a company of women, though religious and godly, shoulde goe about to make a minister, the action is nothing. Of the assumption that popish priests are made by Idolators, I make no question. And when did god giue Idolators leaue to make ministers.

Seing therefore that popish priests are no ministers, I see no shew of probabilitie wherevpon my fayth, or the faith of any can be assured to receiue true baptisme at their hands: vnlesse it can be shewed by you, M. *Some*, that eyther there may bee fayth where there is no promise, or that there is a promise to receaue a sacramente where there is no minister, which no man of any christian modestie wil affirme. Hence also it followeth, that neyther the obstinate crue of recusants in this land, who offer their children to be profaned by trayterous & runnagate Iesuits, nor any els within the body of the Romish Babylon, can assure themselues that their children receiue the substaunce of baptisme.

My

My reaſons beſides that they are no miniſters, are theſe. And I deſire that they may be examined by you, good M. *Some*; where you muſt remember that I ſpeake not of that which hath bene done yeſterday, but of the aſſurance that may be had of that which to morow is to be done.

Where there is no true chriſt whervnto men can bee engraffed by baptiſme: There true baptiſme as touching the ſubſtaunce cannot be gotten; for what baptiſme is that, which is not an ingraffinge into the trne Chriſt. Rom. 6.3. gal.3.27.

But in popery there is no true chriſt, whereunto men may be ingraffed, becauſe he is not the true Chriſte, who eyther will not, or cannot ſatisfie the wrath of God for the ſinnes of the elect, without their merits, and ſuch is the Chriſt profeſſed in popery and no other. Rom.5.15 19. Heb.5.25.

Therefore men can not be aſſured to haue the ſubſtance of baptiſme in the popiſh Church.

No man can aſſure himſelf to haue

the ſubſtance of baptiſme out of the Churche, and that by thoſe that are without the Church, for then a ſacramẽt might be had out of the Church, which were very impious and abſurd to be affirmed.

But popery is out of the Churche, and ſo are all popiſh prieſts.

Therefore no man can aſſure himſelf to haue the ſubſtance of baptiſm in popery by any popiſh prieſt.

That there is no Churche at all in popery, and that al popiſh prieſts are out of the Church, beſids the former reaſons, this one doth further ſhewe, If there be a Churche in popery, or if all popiſhe prieſles be not out of the Churche, then thoſe magiſtrates that haue ſeparated themſelues and their ſubiectes (and all others that made this ſeperation) from the Romiſh religion, as from that ſynagogue where ſaluation is not to be had, and conſequently, where there is no Churche, are ſchiſmatikes, to ſpeake the leaſt. Becauſe it is a ſchiſme to make this ſeparation from the Churche, deteſt

the

the corruptions thereof we may, but make ſuche a ſeparation from the Churche, wee ought not vnleſſe wee would be accounted ſchiſmatiks. But thoſe magiſtrates and their people, that made this ſeparation, are not ſchiſmatickes, becauſe in popery the foundation is ouerthrowen. You ſay in your booke (M. *Some*) page 33. that you could preſſe the argument of the magiſtracie againſt me very far; whether you may or no, that ſhall be conſidered when I deale with the point, but this I am aſſured off, that in this point, you ſhalbe driuen either to defend the abſurditye, that baptiſme is to bee had out of the Churche in a companye eſtraunged from Chriſte, which I thinke you will not doe, or vrged ſo farre, as to the plaine breach of a ſtatute (which far be it from me) euen in the cauſe of treaſon. Will yee ſay that baptiſme may be had out of the Church: the aſſertion is abſurd; or wil you hold that there is a church in popery? the aſſertiō is dangerous, and I haue prooued it falſe. It is dan-

13. Eliza. A ſtrange Church that hath not Chriſt for the foundation.

My meaning is onely to shew the danger, & not to presse the same.

gerous, because it affirmeth our magistrates to be schismatiks, inasmuch as they haue seperated thēselues frō the Church: I hope rather then you will fall into eyther of these pointes, that you will grant me the cause.

Lastly, if men might be assured that they could haue the true substance of baptisme in popery, then they ought not to keep their children from popish baptisme, if there were no other baptisme in the world to be had. For men might come to their baptisme and detest their corruptions, if it bee Gods baptisme, as you M. *Some* affirmed it to be, page 20. And they can ad an edifying worde vnto the sacrament: if the recitall of the wordes of institution be an edifying worde, and that be sufficient to make a sacramēt, both whiche you haue written, page 23.24. But men ought rather to keep their children vnbaptized, then to offer them to be profaned by popish baptisme, both for the former reasons, and because wee ought to haue no more felowship with papists in the ser-

seruice of God, then with pagan Idolaters. M. Caluin hath written otherwise in this point, therefore againe I appeale to the word. L. Zo. Epist. 104.

Seing therefore in popery there is no Church, no ministery, no Christe; seeing we ought in no case to be ioyned with papists in their religion, but to bee separated from them, as from those that are out of the church; and such as are become a very filthy cage and nest of vncleane and sacriledgious Idolators: therefore also it necessarily followeth, that neither our popish recusants, nor any else, offring their children to bee baptized in the popish synagogue, by those polluted and vncleane priests; may assure thēselues that they can bee there pertakers of true baptisme, as touchinge the substance of baptisme.

Nowe to the examination of your reason brought to prooue that they which were baptized in popery, haue receiued true baptisme. Your conclusion you must remember, I do not deny, though your reason prooueth

not the ſame, which is thus framed.

Whoſoeuer deliuer Gods baptiſm, they deliuer true baptiſme; but popiſh prieſtes deliuer Gods baptiſme: therefore true baptiſme.

You haue changed the concluſion from that which was done, vnto that whiche is done, but this ouerſight I omit the aſſumption you thus proue.

Whoſoeuer baptiſe in the name, not of Pope or Idols, but of the holy Trinitie, they deliuer Gods baptiſm; but popiſhe prieſts do baptize in the name of the holy trinitie: therefore they deliuer Gods baptiſme.

Your propoſition in this laſt ſyllogiſme, is moſt falſe, and ſuch as vpon the grant whereof, not onely the cõmunicating with vnpreaching miniſters, might bee aduouched, but alſo Gods whole ordinaunce in the inſtitution of his holy ſacramentes quite ouerthrowen. For if it were true that ther were no more required to make ſubſtantiall baptiſme (as you here require no more) but to baptiſe in the name of the trinitie; then theſe impious

pious absurdities would follow ther-
of.

1 That an Amalekite might deli-
uer true circumcision, as touching
the substance. 2 That true baptism
might bee administred vnto a sub-
staunce not capable of baptisme, but
this odious instaunce I will not vrge.
3 That a woman, 4 That any man
not being a minister, as a child of fiue
yeares olde, a Turke or Iewe might
deliuer true baptism as touching the
substance. For these pronouncing the
wordes of institution, might reteine
by your reason, the essential form of
Christes baptisme, and so to vse your
owne wordes; they baptizing not in
the name of Pope or of Idols, but of
the holy trinitie, should deliuer Gods
baptism and not mans? if Gods bap-
tisme, then true baptisme I am sure.
in like manner, by this reason they
should be Catabaptistes, which denie
men to be rightly baptized by Turks
or women. I would be full sorie that
the errors of the Katabaptists or A-
nabaptistes, coulde not be confuted

by

by you withe ſounder reaſons then this you haue brought; and I would be alſo ſorie that you ſhould defende ſuch abſurd cõſequents as I wil driue you whether you will or no, vnleſſe you reuoke (as I hope you will) that which you haue writté. pardone me I pray you. I deale as reuerently as I may with you, retaining the maieſtie of the cauſe I defend; and I deale not againſt you, but againſt an erroneous aſſertion, which I now leaue; deſiring you very earneſtly, that you woulde conſider how vnreuerently the ordinance of God in the holy ſacraments is dealt with when the ſame is made to depend vpon the pronouncing of a few ſyllables, without any conſideration eyther of the perſon who is to adminiſter, or of the ſubſtantiall forme of conſecration contained in the expoſition of the holy inſtitution of baptiſme, and the inuocation of the name of God, al which are neceſſarily required in the adminiſtration of baptiſme, and could not poſſibly be in Ægypt, where all was and

is

couered vnder the darkneſſe of a ſtrange tongue. Your diſtinction that popiſh prieſts haue a calling, though a faltie, is a begging of the queſtion. For as I haue ſhewed, popiſh prieſtes haue no calling at all in the Church, and therefore how can they ſit in the chaire of the miniſterie? Is there a miniſtery out of the Church, Caiphas his prieſthood commeth afterwarde to bee conſidered of. The ſeconde point is to be handled next.

That vnpreaching miniſters are no miniſters.

They are affirmed to bee no miniſters, not becauſe they are euill miniſters, but becauſe their miniſterye is an euill and profane minininiſtery: So that in this pointe the faulte is not found with the euil miniſter, but with the euill miniſtery. Their miniſtery is profane and euill, becauſe there is no mention made of it in the word. And a miniſterye not mentioned in the worde is no miniſtery but a profane conſtitution. For the Lorde hath expreſſely ſet downe euerye miniſterie of the new teſtament, that ſhould be

in

Ephe.2.11 in the Church vnto the worlds ende; wheras he hath not once mentioned the miniſtery of our readers, becauſe it is not a preaching miniſterye. The ſumme of this whole controuerſie is contayned in theſe three axiomes.

Rom.12.6. 7.8. 1.Cor. 42. 38.rom.10 14. 1.Cor. 1.21. 1 Euery miniſtery is expreſſely ſet downe in the word.

2 Euery miniſtery of the newe teſtament is a preaching miniſtery.

8 The miniſtery of our vnpreaching miniſters, is not a preaching miniſterye.

If you can ſhewe eyther of theſe 3. points to be falſe, I am ouerthrowne, if neyther, you muſt yeeld. The truth of all three, I haue ſhewed out of the word, in the laſt edition of my book. The two former are confirmed by the places quoted on the margent, the latter I will briefly prooue by theſe reaſons.

1 If the miniſtery of vnpreaching miniſters be a preaching miniſterye, or if their function be a paſtorall or doctorall function, then there had bene a preaching miniſtery, a paſto-

rall

rall and doctorall function known in the Church, though there neuer had bene anye preacher therein. Otherwise, howe can their ministerye bee a preaching ministery, or their function bee a pastorall function, whereas the same may bee in the Churche, no preaching ministery or pastorall function beeing knowne there? But no Churche, much lesse a ministery had there beene knowne, if there neuer had bene any that coulde haue preached; because God ordained the saints and so a Churche, onely to be gathered together by preaching ordinarily, but not by the ministery of readers, because it might haue bene in the world, and yet no saint gathered thereby; which thing experience in our Churche prooueth to bee to true.

My 2. and 3 reasons are drawn out of these words of Paule, Rom. 12. 6. 7. 8. Seeing then that wee haue giftes that are diuers, acording to the grace that is giuen vnto vs; whether wee haue propheſie, let vs propheſie, ac-

cording to the proportion of fayth; or an office, let vs wait on the office; or hee that teacheth on teaching, or he that exhorteth on exhorting, &c. the 2. reaſon is thus concluded.

Whoſoeuer hath receiued a miniſterye, and ſo a paſtorall or doctorall function, he hath receiued propheſie ſpoken of in this place, verſe 6. Becauſe euery paſtoral or doctorall function, mencioned in the 7. & 8. verſe, vnder theſe words: he that teacheth, hee that exhorteth; are contained vnder the word propheſie, verſe 6. Inſomuch as he that hath not receiued that propheſie there ſet down, wherby is ment the interpretation of the worde; he hath not receiued the paſtorall or doctoral function ſet down verſ. 7, 8. But vnpreaching miniſters haue not receiued the propheſie ſpoken of in this place, which is expreſly ſet downe, verſe 6. to bee one of the diuers gifts beſtowed for the gouermēt of the body, which is the church. Therefore alſo, they haue receiued neither a paſtorall nor a doctorall fun-

function, and ſo no preaching miniſterye.

3 No miniſtery is ſeperated from a gift, becauſe propheſie ſpoken of in this 6. verſe, vnder which as we ſee, euery paſtorall and doctorall miniſtery is contayned, can not bee ſeuered from a gift: but the miniſtery of our readers is ſeuered in them from a gyft: therefore in them it is no miniſtery.

It is no miniſterye in them I ſay, although that miniſterye, the generall name whereof they haue, is not ſeuered from a gift in preaching miniſters: but what is that to them? what is the miniſterye of other men vnto them? they are not miniſters, by the miniſtery wherewith other men are endued, but by their own, which being ſeuered from a gifte, is no miniſtery. Paul had bene no Apoſtle, and had receiued no Apoſtleſhip, vnleſſe he coulde haue ſayde, I am a miniſter according vnto the grace giuen vnto me, Ephe. 3. 7. and not according to the grace giuen vnto other Apoſtles;

the

the generall name of whose Apostleship I am entituled with. A ridiculous speeche it were, to saye mine apostleshipp hath receiued grace, but I that am the apostle haue receiued none.

How then may our readers claime a preachinge ministerye vnto themselues, seing the ministery which they challenge is altogether in them with out a gifte, though it be not so in others?

4 Euery vnpreaching minister sinneth in executing the works of a pastoral function, as the sacraments. &c therefore he hath no ministery; and so nyether a pastorall nor doctorall function. Hee hath no ministery, because his calling is not the calling of the ministery, his callinge is not the calling of the ministerye, because hee sinneth in intermedlinge withe the workes thereof. And this is an infallible trueth, that no man sinneth because he dealeth with the workes of his calling. For this is the duety that God requireth at the hands of euery man. Manye sinne in deede because they

they walk corruptly in their callings, & haue no care to glorifie God therin. Col. 3. 17. But leaue thy corruption and thou ſinneſt not, in keeping thee to the works of thy calling. The hypocrits in the daies of Iſayah. 1. 13 ſinned not becauſe they offered ſacrifice, but becauſe they did the ſame through hypocriſie. Their hypocriſie they ought to haue lefte, but not his ſeruice in ſacrificing according to his commaundement; but our readers though they ſhould with as little corruption, and as great zeale to Gods glory and the good of his Churche as any men, deale in the workes of a paſtoral miniſtery, yet they ſhould ſtil do that which the Lord had forbidden them to doe, whence it appeareth, that the works of the miniſtery are not the works of their caling. For God forbiddeth no man to deale therewith, & not the being workes of their calling, they are no miniſters, and haue neyther paſtorall nor doctorall function.

5 This is farther ſhewed, foraſmuch

as

as the Lorde doeth not commit vnto bare reders the charge of thoſe ſouls, ouer whom they are, which he doth vnto euerye one that hath a paſtorall ſunction, Acts. 20. 26. 28. 1. theſ. 5. 12 Heb. 13. 17. For to what ende elſe, ſhould he commit a miniſterye vnto anye, who haue ſoules vnder their charge? The Church indeed may cõmit the ſouls of men vnto reders, but certainly the Lord committeth none vnto them. And he is no miniſter, vnto whom the Lorde doth not cõmite this charge, as the places before quoted do ſhew. For the Lord hath in his word, ordained not onely offices, the executors whereof ſhoulde haue the ouerſight of ſoules, but alſo the perſons who were to execute thoſe functions. 1. Cor. 12. 28. 1. Pet. 4. 10. rom 12. 6. 7. 8. Epheſ. 4. 7. 11. Now vnpreaching miniſters are non of thoſe perſons, becauſe the Lorde knoweth thẽ not to bee able to feede ſoules. And let not men bee ſo iniurious vnto the Lorde, as to affirme, that hee according vnto his reuealed ordinance

(for

(for therof I speke as of a ministery, & not of his secret iudgments) bequeathed the soules of men to be starued and kept from saluation. As hee must needes be conuinced to doe if he bequeathed them vnto those men, the dispensation of whose ministery is able to beget none, feede none, saue none. you must vnderstande againe, that I speake of the ministery whereby readers are ministers, that is of their owne, and not of the ministery whereby preaching ministers are ministers, wherewith readers haue nothing to doe.

Moreouer howe can the Lorde bee saide to commit the charge of soules according to his owne reuealed ordinance, vnto those who may truely obiect vnto him, that he dealeth iniuriously with thē, by exacting those thinges to bee perfourmed at their handes and in their owne persons, as necessary duties of their callings, vnto the performaunce whereof, they haue receiued no abilitie from him. Is man to bee aunswerable vnto the

Lord

Lorde of that which he neuer receyued? doth the Lorde require the vſe of that tallent which hee neuer beſtowed? doth he laye that vpon any, whereof hee may haue iuſte cauſe to complaine? when did hee impoſe a charge vpon any, vnto whom he gaue not gifts to diſcharge the ſame? now the charge of ſoules whiche he committeth vnto anye, hee requireth at their handes vnto whom he hath cõmitted it, which he could not doe, if hee had not giuen abilitie to the diſcharge thereof.

What then? ſhall ignoraunt miniſters be free from the blood of ſouls, in aſmuch as the lord neuer cõmitted any ſoule vnto their charge. It were well with thẽ poore men, if the caſe ſo ſtood. But alas it is not ſo. And yet the cauſe of their deſtruction proceedeth not from their vnfaithfulneſſe in the diſcharge of that vocation whiche hee hath allotted vnto them, but it commeth iuſtly vpon them, in that they haue deſperatly thruſt thẽſelues contrary vnto Gods reuealed

will

will, vpon thoſe men with the ouer-ſight of whoſe ſoules God neuer truſted ſuch as they are. The Lord ſayth vnto them, intrude your ſelues and you will, vnto the places of paſtors, and ſo enforce me to bring heauy & ſwift damnation vpon you: but ſurely I wil bequeath no ſoule vnto your cuſtodye. They on the other ſide in their practiſe ſay, Lord whether thou committeſt vnto vs any charge of any ſoule or no, wee care not, but rather then wee ſhoulde not haue the meanes to liue in this life, (for this is their onely ſcope in continuinge in the miniſterye) require the blood of ſoules, and what thou wilte at our hands. And ſo ſenſeles men, they ſell them-ſelues, body and ſoule vnto euerlaſting wo and deſtruction.

The pretence that the Lord committeth the chardge of ſoules vnto their miniſtery, and not vnto them, is firſt a deſiring of that in queſtion; (for they are denyed to haue any miniſtery) and otherwiſe many wais vnſufficient. 1 Becauſe the Lord committeth

teth not the charge of ſoules there, where the puniſhement of their deſtruction cannot take holde, as it can not vpon the miniſtery: 2 the miniſtry is but a dead thing of it ſelf; moſt beautifull in deed, as being an ordinance of the Lorde, but able to ſaue none, vnleſſe it be committed vnto a perſon, who in the execution therof, is able to ſhew himſelf to be appointed of God for that glorious worke. This is taught Epheſ. 4. where the Apoſtle verſes 6 and 7. hauing ſpoken of the giftes beſtowed vpon men for this miniſteriall work, aſcribeth verſ. 11. 12. the gathering together of the ſayntes, not vnto the giftes or functions, but vnto men endued with the ſayde giftes. For he doth not ſay that the Lord hath appointed for the gathering together of the ſaynts, an apoſtleſhipp, a paſtorall or doctorall function, &c. but that he ordained apoſtles, paſtors, &c. for that end and purpoſe; whereunto becauſe our readers were not appoynted, it forcibly enſueth that they haue no miniſtery,

Act. 20. 28.

no

no paſtorall or doctorall function, and ſo are no miniſters: which concluſió alſo in the laſt edition of mine Exhortation vnto my countrimen, I haue enforced by manye ſtrong and as I am aſſured inuincible reaſons, drawne out of the infallible trueth of Gods worde. I woulde intreate yon M. *Some*, when you haue anſwered the reaſons I haue nowe ſet downe to anſwere alſo, the 1. 2. 3. and 25. reaſon that I haue there vſed. For you ſhall but ſtriue in vayne againſt the concluſion, as long as the premiſes whereby it is inferred remaine firme. If the reader woulde be further ſatiſfied in this poynte concerning the dumbe miniſtery, he is to be referred vnto that which in the aforeſaid treatiſe I haue ſet downe.

Nowe to the concluſion, If vnpreaching miniſters be no miniſters, and if I cannot be aſſured to receiue a ſacrament, but onely at the hands of a miniſter; both which you ſee M. *Some* to be prooued by me, then cannot I aſſure my ſelfe, that an vnpreaching mini-

miniſter can deliuer a ſacrament vnto me: and therefore it is vnlawfull for me or any chriſtian to go vnto an vnpreaching miniſter for the ſacraments; if vnlawfull, then a ſinne, if a ſin, thé the godly are polluted which goe vnto them for the ſacramentes: you know (M. *Some*) what I meane by an vnpreaching miniſter; namely, euery one learned or vnlearned, that cannot ſhewe him-ſelfe by the good trial of his gifts, to haue that fitnes to teach, whereof we read. 2. tim. 2. 2, 1. tim. 3. 3. which ability the Lord doth not ordinarily beſtowe vpon any in theſe our dayes, without the knowledge of the artes, eſpecially the two handmaydes of all learninge, Rhethoricke and Logick, and the two originall tongues wherein the worde was written. And therefore I am as farre from accounting the vnskilfull preachers, which ſpeake hand ouerhead, they care not what; againſte whom your complaint is very iuſt to be miniſters, as I am from acknowledging many of our abſurd doctors

to

to be apt to teach, who can bring nothing into the pulpit, but that which other men haue written, and that very often, ſo fit to the purpoſe, of edification, as the reaſon from the corner to the ſtaffe, is ſoundly concluded. In theſe three ſortes of ſuppoſed miniſters (and there could be a fourth added vnto them) conſiſteth the woe of our Church.

The reſt of your booke is nowe to be examined. Your concluſion, page 22. that they which were baptized by vnpreching miniſters, are rightly baptized as touching the ſubſtaunce of baptiſme; I do not gainſay. Your reaſons are weake. For how coulde wee proue your concluſion, if men ſhould denie popiſh baptiſm to be true baptiſm, as I do not you know & he ſhuld do me great iniurie, which would lay that to my charge. Were it ſufficient for vs to ſay they were Katabaptiſtes which denie popiſhe baptiſme? How could this be proued? and this ſhould not prooue the matter doubted off. Shall wee ſaye that they ſinne, in not

pre-

preſenting themſelues to be bapti-
zed, To whome ſhoulde they preſent
themſelues? who would baptize the?
Admit they ſinned in receauing the
Lords Supper before they were bap-
tized, ſhould they therefore bee be-
reaued of the comfort of baptiſme?
to affirme that this weare a goinge
backward, is no reaſon, becauſe they
were perſwaded that they had bap-
tiſme, otherwiſe they would not haue
beene ſo farr on their iourney, vntill
they had beene accompanied there-
with. But they omitted baptiſme of
ignorance and not of contemt: ther-
fore they denie the receiuing of the
Lordes ſupper to haue bene a ſinne,
anye more then it woulde be a ſinne
in them nowe to receiue the Lordes
ſupper, if they coulde not haue bap-
tiſme, Baptiſme they woulde haue, if
they coulde orderlye come by the
ſame. Becauſe men will bee ſo iniuri-
ous vnto them, as to denie them the
comfort of baptiſme which they can-
not haue, ſhould they denie to them-
ſelues the comfort of the Lords ſup-

per

per which they may haue? Ye, but no vncircumciſed might eate the paſcall lambe. Exod. 12.48. True; But what ſhall we ſay vnto thoſe that were vncircumciſed in the wilderneſſe fortie yeres almoſt. Ioſh. 5.5. Did they neuer eate the paſſeouer all that time? If they did, the place of Exodus will be quickly anſwered. It is plaine that the paſſeouer was celebrated in the wildernes once at the leaſt. Nom. 9.1, If euery yeare, why ſhould the godly of the family be excluded from the family be excluded from the action, the cauſe why they were vncircumciſed not being in them. None vncircumciſed might miniſter before the altar. True, but did non of the Leuits that were borne in the wilderneſſe teach Iaacob the law, or offer the incenſe of his God in all thoſe fourtye yeares?

Thus many thinges you ſee might be obiected againſt your reaſons, & I take the obiections to bee of ſome waight, It had bin well you had conſidered of them before you had publiſhed

liſhed your booke. And the baptiſme by vnpreaching miniſters, muſt haue better prooffes then anye you haue brought as yet, or elſe I feare me, our poſterities will not be ſatisfied therwith.

Your next reaſon, page 23. is ſlender. Readers pronounce the wordes of inſtitution with the deliuerie of the element, therfore ſaye you they deliuer a ſacrament: you haue once already alledged this to prooue popiſh baptiſme, page 20. I haue anſwered it page 29.30.31. And the place of Matth. 28.29. brought in by you page 23. proueth your conſequent to bee falſe. For it ſheweth that he who is to baptiſe, muſt bee alſo able to teache, which abilitie is wanting in our readers. Go ſayth our Saniour, and teach all nations, baptizing, &c. Therefore if he that deliuereth the element bee not able to teach, we cannot be aſſured that it is a ſacrament. Becauſe the commandement is not generally to all that could pronounce the wordes of inſtitution, beeing thereunto permit-

mitted by the corruptiō of the time, but perticularly limited vnto them that can teache, vnleſſe you will ſaye, that the Lorde biddeth thē go teach, who cannot teach whiche were not once to be conceiued of his maieſtie. The corruptiō in the Church of England, that the deliuery of the element ſhold be ſeuered from the preaching of the word, is a breach of Gods ordinance, you cannot deny, Matth. 28 19. act. 20. 7. and therefore vngodly and intollerable. Whether it mak the action fruſtrate or no, that is not the queſtion.

Your 3. reaſon pag. 24. is this.

Vnpreaching miniſters do ad an edifying word vnto the element, therfore it is a ſacramente. This reaſon is the ſame with the former, which sheweth the great nakednes and pouerty of the cauſe, that one reaſon muſt be thriſe periured to proue the goodnes of it, which notwithſtanding it cānot ſhew. I deny the antecedent, & conſequent. Your reaſon of the antecedent, that the recitall of the ſum

of Christs Sermon that is, the wordes of institution is an edifying worde is false, and maintaineth charming. For do you thinke that the worde of institution, being as you say, the summ of Christes Sermon, is then an edifying word, whensoeuer it is recited by a profane person, euen in the profanation of Gods ordinance? Looke 2. tim. 4.3. and you shall finde that the worde barely reade, and to no other purpose then to edifie by reading, is not wholesome doctrine. The popish prieste eyther without or within the booke, pronounceth in his darke Latine, the summ of Christes Sermon, is that an edifying word, which he profanely breatheth. The worde of God vttered, is not an edifying worde, vnles it be vttered according to the ordinance, both in regarde of the persons that vtter the same, and the end wherefore it is vttered. No learned man will denie the Lordes prayer rightly sayd to be an edifying worde. And yet by your leaue, no learned man vnlesse he fauoreth charming or

popery, will say that the Lords prayer pronounced by an ignorant man, in a strange tongue, or profaned by a witch, is an edifying word.

Concerning your consequent, doe you thinke that euerye one that can ad an edifying word vnto the elemēt, may minister a sacrament? it is not so. For Paul requireth the words of euery christian (wemen & al) to be edifying wordes, Eph. 4.29. euen in common talk. Shal therefore the element administred by euerye christian be a sacrament? God forbid. And yet euery christian can ad the sum of Christs sermon vnto the element in the administration of the supper; which if it were sufficient, as by your reason it is, then wemen, children, &c. idiots that coulde not read might deliuer a sacrament.

The reason concluding vnpreaching ministers to be non, because they are not apt to teache, you haue twise repeated within one twelue lines, pag 24.25. and made two seuerall obiections thereof. That was an ouersight:

the

The ſufficiencie of the argument, I haue ſhewed to be ſuche, as Caiphas his miniſtery, and Herods magiſtracy brought in by you, pag. 25. 26. will neuer aunſwer the ſame. Both of them with the reaſon from the outwarde calling of readers, pag. 25. I referre to your next chapter, where they are repeated: thyther nowe I am come, where the contradictorie of the queſtion ſhall be ſet downe and prooued briefly; becauſe the nullitie of the vnpreaching miniſtery, may be in ſteede of a 1000. reaſons to proue the ſame. By pollution, I doubt not, you meane ſinne.

The godly do ſinne, which do communicate with vnpreaching miniſters.

Becauſe 1. they communicate with thoſe who are no miniſters. 2. they cannot be aſſured to receiue a ſacrament at their hands. 3 they do not examine them-ſelues aright, and ſo are not worthy receiuers, 1. Cor. 11. 28. inaſmuch as they do not acknowledg it a ſinne to communicat where there is no miniſter. 4. becauſe they either

eyther make the element to bee a sacrament naturally in it selfe, and not by the ordinance of God, or els think the ordinance of God in the institution of the sacrament onely to consist in the recitall of the words; I baptize thee, &c. or take eate, &c, wheras a minister is a most principall part of the ordinance. 5 Because they make the sacraments to be marks no more essentiall vnto the Church, then to other idolatrous synagogues. For the element may be deliuered out of the Church by a publike person, euen as substantially, as by our mere readers. 6 They approoue the sin of the vnpreaching ministery. Lastly, because they are perswaded, that Christ doth deliuer vnto them the seales of their saluation, by the hands of those that are not ministers; to wit, by vnpreaching readers. In al which points, the godly sinne, and therefore are polluted in communicating with vnpreaching ministers. Nowe let vs see howe you haue proued the contrary.

Where the reader must againe be

put

put in minde, that 1 you haue prooued nothing vnleſſe the queſtion bee graunted vnto you: and 2 that your reaſons are repeated too often.

The miniſters ignorance ſaye you, page 28. cannot peruert Gods ordinance: and againe, page 29. the ſacramentes are not the worſe for the ignorance of the miniſter, &c. All this I grant, but bare readers are not miniſters, and the doubt is, whether the action performed by them be the ordinaunce of God, whether it be a ſacramēt. Theſe be the queſtions which you ought to haue prooued, and not haue taken thē as principles, though you do this: the 3 and 4 time, pag 28. line 6. and 24.

M.D. *Some*, pag. 28. the worthy pertaker receiues a bleſsing, if a bleſsing no pollution.

John Penri; firſt it is doubted whether we may be aſſured that it is a ſacrament; 2 he is no worthye receiuer that receiueth of an Idoll miniſter: 3 there may be a bleſsing receiued, & yet pollution in the receiuer:

Looke

Looke 2. Chronic. 30. 17. 18. 19. Nom. 9. 7. The obiection concerning the giuer & the receiuer, in your 31. pa. was neuer mine: I coulde turne it againſt you, but I muſt be briefe.

Concerning the nullity of our readers miniſtery, we are to knowe that there is a nullitie of a miniſterye before God; eyther becauſe the action proceedeth from a corrupt miniſter, as pſalm. 50. 16. whom God would not haue to deale with his ordinances, or 2
from a corrupt and euill miniſterye, which is none of Gods ordinaunce. The action of the former is ſubſtantiall in regard of vs, of the latter wee know no ſubſtance it can haue. Of the former there is a nullitie onely in the ſight of God; of the latter, both in reſpect of the Lorde and alſo of vs. The nullitie of our readers miniſtery is of this latter ſorte, namely ſuche as we ought in no wiſe to account a miniſtery. Whereas therefore you graunt that there is a nullity of our readers miniſtery before God, and yet affirm them to be miniſters, you ſwarue fró the

the point, and ſo your anſwere, page 31. Is nothinge to the purpoſe, but a deſiring of the queſtion after your vſuall manner. As Caiphas then, and the reſt of the ſleepye dogges againſt whom the prophet cryeth out, were wicked men, God woulde not haue ſuch to be his miniſters: hyther refer Iſa. 1.13. but as they had the miniſtery which God allowed of, they were miniſters vnto the people. This miniſtery, our readers want, therfore they can be miniſters, neither in reſpect of the Lord, nor of the Church. Shemaiah was a wicked man, and a falſe prophet, ſo were the reſt of his ſtamp. The Lord deteſted both thē & their miniſtery. Zephania & Caiphas hie prieſts with their cōpany, were as wicked as any of the falſe prophetes, the Lord abhorred the mē, but their miniſtery was his ordinance.

Isa.56.9.

Ier.29.31. Zac.14.14. 29.9. Zach 13.5. Iere. 29.25.

There is a difference betweene the nullitie of the miniſter, and the nullity of the miniſtery.

Hence M. *Some*, it followeth, that neyther the bribery of your Caiphas, nor the blindenes of your ignoraunt Leuites, can make ſuche a nullitie of their prieſthood, as they ſhould be no

prieſts

prieſtes vnto the people. And therefore great reaſon whie the parentes of our ſauiour, & the reſt of the godly whereof you ſpeake. page 28, 29. ſhould not leaue the ſeruice of God for the pollution of the prieſtes. Iſai ſpeaketh againſt blind watchmen, 56 10, but chap. 42. 19. 20. It ſhal appear that they ſaw many things, but kept them not, I pray you confer the places and it can neuer be prooued that any of them were ſo blinde, as they could not declare by preachinge the generall vſe of the ſacrifices and ceremonies. Their wants might be many but not like the inſufficiency of our readers. Beit they were as inſufficient yet their miniſtery might be allowable. For

Vnfitnes to teach, made not a nullitie of the Leuiticall prieſts office.

Becauſe 1 it was ſufficient to make him a lawfull, though not a good prieſt, for him to be of the line of Aron: 2 there was no commandemét concerning the tryall of his fitnes to teach: 3 It is not mentioned that Nom. 3. 10 Leuit. 8. Exo. 29.

any were put from the pristhood for want of this ability, wheras the dout whether they were the sonnes of Aaron. Ezra. 2. 63. and their idolatry, 2. Chron. 23. 9. bereaued them thereof; Act. 21. 26. 4 the example of Paule confirmeth this, who commnnicated sincè his conuersion with those prists that wer as vnlearned as euer anye; whiche he woulde not haue done if inability to teach, had made them no priests.

Nowe therefore M. *Some* to make your argument from the Leuiticall priesthood to bee forcible. For your vnpreching ministers, you must proue that either our readers ministery is a Leuiticall ministery, that the continuance therof is vnder the new couenãt or shew that the corrupt aprobation, for so I name the best outwarde calling they can haue of the Churche, is as forcible to make thẽ ministers, as was the ordinaunce of God to make the sons of Aaron sacrificing at Ierusalem to be priests. Now,

That the corrupt allowance of the Church cannot make our readers to be substanciall ministers.

For

For ſo all men and wemen, without or within the Church might be capable of the miniſtery, becauſe all may be capable of this outward alowãce; 2 and perticularly a man, not furniſhed with naturall capacity; 3 a man that could not read, though he wanted alſo the gift of interpretation; for ſuche a one might recite the liturgie without the booke; 4 the Churche might make a man miniſter againſt his will, though he ſhould neuer conſent thervnto. And this is the willingnes that I meane, when I ſay that the inward caling is contained in the ſufficiency of gifts, & willingnes to practize, which willingnes I gather vpon the wordes, *Epithymei* and *oregetai*, vſed of the Apoſtle. Your reaſon therfore from the malicious Philippian miniſters, toucheth not the queſtion. Thus Caiphas with his crue of vnworthye and monſtrous prieſts (who within a fewe pages, in your booke haue impudently ſo often troubled the reader) is anſwered. And I thinke it a great iudgment of God that the orna-

1. Tim. 3. 1.

ornaments of our Engliſh and welch miniſtery, for the moſt part conſiſteth in the deformitie of ſuche lothſome ſpots,

M.D. *Some* page 32. They of whoſe magiſtracie there is a nullitye before God, though they haue an outwarde calling, ought not to bee accounted magyſtrates. *I.P.* You demand what I thinke of this propoſition. Surely my iudgement is, that it is altogether without ſence, and ouerthroweth it ſelf. For it is as if you ſaid, he of whoſe fayth there is a nullitye before God, though he be aſſured of his ſaluation is not to be accounted a faythful mā. Why? to be aſſured of ſaluation, & to haue a nullitie of fayth before God, cannot ſtand together. No more can the outward calling of the magiſtracy ſtand with the nullity thereof. For the outwarde calling maketh a ſubſtantiall magiſtrate.

There be three eſſentiall differences betweene an euill magiſtrate and a reading miniſter

1 The outwarde calling of an euill magiſtrate, maketh him a ſubſtantial magi-

magiſtrate, ſo cannot the outward allowance of readers make them to be miniſters. 2 The magiſtracie of an euill magiſtrate, may be allowable before God, ſo cannot the miniſtery of readers. 3 Men may bee aſſured to receiue that accordinge to the ordinaunce of God ſubſtantially at the handes of an euill magiſtrate, which concerneth them to haue from him, ſo can they not of a bare reader; For there is no man that can aſſure himſelfe to be partaker of a ſubſtantiall ſacrament, at the hands of ſuch, and preache they cannot. I haue handled this poynte of the magiſtracie in my former booke, from page 47. to 51.

But M. *Some*, where is that reaſon which you could preſſe ſo far? is this it? they of whoſe magiſtracie there is a nullity before God, ought not to be accounted magiſtrates. I ſay your propoſition is true, aſſume what you wil, you know what maner of nullity I meane.

My reaſon concluding the vnlawfulnes of communicatinge with readers

ders hauing but an outward calling: becauſe it is a ſinne to communicate with them, whiche onely want the ſame hauing fitnes to teache, is ſuch as I can not but maruell that you would thinke it could bee anſwered by a deſiring of the queſtion, which is a fault in reaſoninge, wherein be like you ſeeme to take delight; you ſay againe, that readers deliuer a ſacrament. How can we be ſure thereof, & why may not I ſay as well, that a man indued with giftes to teach, doth deliuer a ſacrament, though he haue no outwardè calling, whiche aſſertion would be falſe. By an extraordinarye ſacrament, I meane baptiſme or the Lords ſupper, adminiſtred either priuatly by a miniſter, or any way by on that is no miniſter. I neuer affirmed, the elements deliuered by readers to be ſacraments. It is one thing not to deny them, another thing to affirme them to be ſacraments; the former I haue written, the latter I neuer did; & they doe my writinges great iniurie, that report the contrary.

Thus

Thus M. *Some* I haue run through the pointes in your booke that concerned me, I haue beene driuen to deale briefly therein. I had determined, and I am inforced to ende, and to omit that, which page 9. line 11. I promiſed to handle in the latter end, with diuers other. I haue not the like libertie for printing that you M. *Some* doe inioy. Let me but haue the fauor to bee iudicially heard according to the word, and I will perſonally vpon the perill of my life, defend theſe two points againſt all men. I am ſory that you whom I reuerence, ſhould be the inſtrument to oppugne a trueth.

The Lord reſpect the cauſe of his owne glorie, and pardon our ſinne.

Amen.

ERRATA.

Page 1. line 20. & 23. for 2. read 3.

pag. 47. line 14. blot out, family be excluded from the

14 FEB 87
MUSEUM